



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,360	07/14/2003	Yechezkal Evan Spero		1359
37268	7590	06/03/2008		
YECHEZKAL EVAN SPERO			EXAMINER	
74 MOSHAV TIFRACH				TRUONG, BAO Q
M. P. HANEGEV, 85102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ISRAEL				2875
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/604,360	SPERO, YECHEZKAL EVAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BAO Q. TRUONG	2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 50-69 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 57,58 and 67 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 50-56,59-66,68 and 69 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 57, 58 and 67 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the optimal illuminance level is uniform illumination over the surfaces at a certain height within the living space whether the surface is directly below the illuminating device or off in a distant corner of claim 57, and the optimal illuminance is increased task lighting illuminance in a certain area of the living space and general lighting illuminance level over the rest of the area of claim 58, and the calculation of Lambert's Law of claim 67 are not shown in the Species I of figure 1; or a proposed combined Species I, II and III by the applicant (see restriction requirement on 12/14/2004 and the respond to the restriction on 1/13/2005).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 57, 58 and 67 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 54, 55, 62, 63 and 69 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 54 and 55, there are lack of antecedent basis for “the predetermined surfaces” and “the respective predetermined surfaces” in lines 1-3.

Claim 62, all elements in claim “Markush Group” type should be equivalent. For example, there are different categories of “a power supply” and “a controller” and “a storage media”.

Claim 63, there is lack of antecedent basis for “said controller” in claim.

Claim 69, the claim should be end with a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 50-56, 59-66 and 68-69 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claims are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 50-56, 59, 60, 64-66 and 68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zhang et al. [US 6,227,679 B1].

Regarding claims 50-56, 60, 64, 65, 66 and 68-69, Zhang et al. discloses an illuminating device having a multiple light source [A, B, C, D, E, C1] having spectral distribution and light distribution patterns [see figures 1-2], a light source mounting structure [24] configured to mount and arrange the light sources to form light distribution patterns and with angles for producing overall light distribution pattern without recourse to at least one of non-integral reflector and refractors (figures 1-3, whole document).

Regarding claim 59, Zhang et al. discloses LEDs (abstract).

Regarding claim 62, Zhang et al. discloses a power connection apparatus [16, 12] (figures 2-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of Chen [US 6,820,998 B2].

Regarding claim 61, Zhang et al. discloses the illuminating device [see figures 1-3] but does not disclose the means for sensing the changes, and the means for changing the light emanating characteristics of the light sources.

Chen discloses the means [1, 3] for sensing the changes, and the means [8, 9, 10, 11] for changing the light emanating characteristics of the light sources (figures 1-4, whole document).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the illumination device of Zhang et al. with the means as taught by Chen to control the illumination device for purpose of providing an advantageous way of adjusting light intensities while saving electrical source.

8. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of Lys et al. [US 6,340,868].

Regarding claim 63, Zhang et al. discloses an illuminating device (figures 1-4); However, Zhang et al. does not clearly disclose the controller being selected from the closed loop controller by use of a programming method.

Lys et al. discloses the controller being selected from the closed loop controller by use of a programming method for a current control of a LED lighting assembly

(abstract, figures 1-2, column 4 lines 57-65, column 5 lines 3-5, column 6, lines 53-57, column 9 lines 45-55, column 16 lines 56-63).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the illuminating device of Zhang et al. by the current controller as taught by Lys et al. to adjust light intensity and color for purpose of providing an advantageous way of more accuracy controlling current flow into LEDs.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BAO Q. TRUONG whose telephone number is (571) 272-2383. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra L. O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bao Q. Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2875